REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 2 December 2003. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1 through 3 have been cancelled by this Amendment and new Claim 4 has been added.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the Claims were generally narrative and indefinite, and failed to conform with current U.S. practice. The Examiner stated that the Claims occurred to be a literal translation into English from a foreign language, as they were replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claims 1 through 3 have been replaced by a new Claim 4 which is believed to correct those errors kindly noted by the Examiner. Thus, it is believed that new Claim 4 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Wong, U.S. Patent No. 4,764,148, in view of Dehner, U.S. Patent No. 3,942,285. However, the Examiner kindly

indicated that Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The subject matter of Claim 2 has been rewritten as new Claim 4. Therefore, it is believed that Claim 4 is patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: _26 Feb 2004_

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

04586
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE